



# United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/993,359	11/19/2001	Scott D. Slomiany	2100/23	1396
75	90 03/24/2004		EXAM	INER
Michael H. Ba	niak		COBURN, C	ORBETT B
BANIAK PINE & GANNON Suite 1200			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
150 N. Wacker Drive			3714	9
Chicago, IL 60606			DATE MAILED: 03/24/200	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			9				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	09/993,359	SLOMIANY ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Corbett B. Coburn	3714					
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence address -	••				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stany reply received by the Office later than three months after the mearmed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of third will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC atute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed irty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communicated the communicate (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ation.				
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1	3 September 2003						
3) Since this application is in condition for allo							
Disposition of Claims							
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-116 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-108 and 116 is/ 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 109-115 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	are withdrawn from conside	ration.					
Application Papers							
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam  10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 21 November 2001  Applicant may not request that any objection to  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor  11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	is/are: a) accepted or b) the drawing(s) be held in abeyonection is required if the drawing	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.12					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International Bu * See the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received.  nents have been received in  priority documents have been  reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Stage					
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB	Paper No	r Summary (PTO-413) b(s)/Mail Date i Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)					

Art Unit: 3714

jes.

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## **Drawings**

1. The drawings are objected to because of the issues noted on the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

#### Election/Restrictions

2. Applicant's election with traverse of Group XIV (claims 109-115) in Paper No. 7 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that these claims and claims in Group XII (90-102 & 104-108) do not require divergent searches. This is not found persuasive because it appears that the details of the dice games are different. This is particularly true in the dependent claims that discuss the various paytable arrangements and methods of ending the game. While the apparatus used may be similar, there are substantial differences in the details of the games played on that apparatus. These differences would require a burdensome search.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3714

4. Claims 109-115 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto et al. (US Patent Number 5,263,715) in view of Edgeworth (US Patent Number 2,125,236) and Bunco Rules.

Claim 109: Matsumoto teaches a gaming machine with a video display device (1) and a CPU (17) having a program operating a dice game. (Abstract). There is a wager input mechanism (6) which registers a wager placed by a player. The program establishes a set of differing game play dice elements (.e., there are two dice). Matsumoto teaches craps. (Col 2, 61-63) In craps, there is a subset of at least one match point at the start of the game. If a player throws a 7 or 11 (a natural), the player wins. If the player throws a 2, 3, or 12 (a crap), the player loses. If the player throws any other number, the player must continue to throw until the player matches the number originally thrown (the point) or throws a 7. These naturals, craps, and points are all match points. Each match point has a match indicium (i.e., pips on the dice) for potential matching with a subsequent toss of the dice elements. The program establishes and displays a random toss of a plurality of dice elements at each stage of play, and determines at a stage of play whether the randomly selected indicium matches the match indicium of the match point. There is a payout mechanism providing an award according to a predetermined paytable for each match on a toss. (Col 3, 14-18) (Figs 4 & 5)

Matsumoto does not, however, teach Bunco or matching each die element tossed with the indicium on a single die. Edgeworth teaches implementing Bunco on a slot machine. (Col 1, 32-36) In Bunco, each die element tossed is matched with the indicium on a single die. Bunco is an extremely popular game and has been for over a century. It

Art Unit: 3714

۳,

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Matsumoto in view of Edgeworth (and the rules of Bunco) to have implemented a Bunco game in which each die element tossed is matched with the indicium on a single die in order to take advantage of the popularity of Bunco.

Claim 110: The rules of Bunco describe a bonus (i.e., fuzzy dice) for scoring a "Bunco". A Bunco is when all dice match the match point. Furthermore, progressive jackpots (i.e., those that increase with each round of play until won) are well known to the art. Such bonus awards attract players. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Matsumoto in view of Edgeworth and the rules of Bunco to have the payout mechanism include a second paytable provided for a bonus award, said second paytable increasing in bonus award value with each successive stage of play (a progressive jackpot), and including the step of awarding a bonus award if all dice elements on a toss have the same randomly selected indicium which also matches a match indicium in order to implement the suggestion of an award for scoring a Bunco and to attract players.

Claim 111: Bunco uses three dice (i.e., three dice elements are established and displayed as being tossed at each stage of play.)

Claim 112: In Bunco, any match point that is not matched on a toss is eliminated. (If the match point is 2 and the player fails to throw a 2, the "2" round is over and that match point is eliminated.) The rules teach determining whether to continue with a toss on a subsequent stage of play up to a preset maximum number of stages (6) provided that at least one match point remains for each such subsequent stage. If a player tosses a 1 in the

Art Unit: 3714

£1\

1 round, the 1 round continues until the player tosses a set of dice that does not contain a

1. Then the player tries to match the next match point (2). This continues through six rounds.

Claim 115: Edgeworth teaches a game of "twenty six" in which a plurality of match points are established, each of said plurality of match points having a match indicium selected at random (by the player). Some or all of the match indicia of the plurality of match points may thereby be the same. (Col 1, 13-31) (Note that when playing by hand, the player is described as choosing a single match point. But the machine version allows the choosing of multiple match points —"through the intermediation of a token for each point chosen." (Col 1, 26-27)

5. Claims 113 & 114 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto, Edgeworth and Bunco Rules as applied to claim 109 above, and further in view of Falciglia (US Patent Number 5,647,798).

Claims 113 & 114: Matsumoto, Edgeworth and Bunco Rules teach the invention substantially as claimed, but do not teach randomly allocated free advancement features (i.e., "free spins") or their use to continue the game when it would otherwise terminate. Falciglia teaches "free spins". Free spins are well known to attract players because they give a player a second chance when the player would otherwise lose. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Matsumoto, Edgeworth and Bunco Rules in view of Falciglia to randomly allocate free advancement features (i.e., "free spins") to be used to continue the game when it would

Art Unit: 3714

otherwise terminate in order to give a player a second chance when the player would otherwise lose, thus attracting players.

### Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Reference Name	US Patent Number	Applicability
Koch	1,781,983	Device for playing Bunco
Renz	1,887,068	3-dice game
Banyai	6,702,668	Number matching game

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Corbett B. Coburn whose telephone number is (703) 305-3319. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5:30, Monday-Friday, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Hughes can be reached on (703) 308-1806. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

chc

JESSICA HARRISON DENIARY EXAMINER